

THE YANCEY RECORD
 BURNSVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

ESTABLISHED 1936

EDWARD A. YUZIUK - EDITOR & PUBLISHER
 CAROLYN R. YUZIUK - ASSOCIATE EDITOR
 MISS PATSY BRIGGS - OFFICE MANAGER

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY
 YANCEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT BURNSVILLE, N.C.
 THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1970 NUMBER THIRTY-FIVE

SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$3.00/YEAR
 OUT OF COUNTY \$5.00/YEAR

**SENATOR
 SAM ERVIN
 SAYS**



WASHINGTON -- The objective of the House-passed Equal Rights Amendment is a worthy one. It is to abolish unfair discriminations which society makes against women in certain areas of life. No one believes more strongly than I that discriminations of this character ought to be abolished, and that they ought to be abolished by law in every case where they are created by law.

Even so, I am convinced that this House-passed Amendment is a potentially destructive and self-defeating blunderbuss which would invalidate all laws making distinctions between men and women, and would plunge society into a constitutional and legal chaos. I say this because the House passed Amendment is shrouded in obscurity, and no one has sufficient prophetic power to predict with accuracy what interpretation the Supreme Court will place upon it. I share the view of many constitutional scholars that if the Senate should approve the House-passed Amendment and three-fourths of the states should ratify it, this amendment would be interpreted to nullify every existing federal and state law making any distinction whatever between men and women, and would rob Congress and the legislatures of the 50 states of the legislative power to enact any future laws making any distinctions between men and women, no matter how reasonable these laws may be.

When one examines the realities of the House-passed Amendment, he finds that it would not bring into being any new laws giving us a discrimination-free society, and those who desire such a society would again have to implore Congress and the legislatures of the 50 states to enact laws creating the kind of society they seek insofar as such a society can be established by law. It should be noted that many just grievances are founded upon discriminations not created by law, and the Equal Rights Amendment would have no effect whatsoever upon them.

The issue before the Senate then is not whether society makes unfair discriminations against women, but whether the House-passed Amendment constitutes a sensible approach to their abolition. This raises the question of whether Congress should submit to the states an amendment to the Constitution to deal with this matter, and whether such amendment should permit Congress and the states, acting within their respective jurisdictions, to make reasonable distinctions between the rights and responsibilities of men and women in appropriate areas of life.

In my judgment, the 14th Amendment's "equal protection clause" properly interpreted is sufficient to abolish all unfair discriminations against women. Nonetheless, I recognize that many do not share my opinion on this point. For this reason, last week I introduced an alternative amendment to insure equality of women's rights, but one which would not place upon the Supreme Court the obligation to sail upon the most tumultuous constitutional seas without chart or compass in quest of an undefined and unknown port.

In brief, my amendment would state that equality of rights shall not be abridged because of sex. Moreover, it would (1) specifically exempt women from compulsory military service, and (2) allow the passage of any law "reasonably designed to promote the health, safety, privacy, education, or economic welfare of women, or to enable them to perform their duties as homemakers or mothers."

My amendment has the virtue of recognizing that there are physiological and functional differences between men and women, and in my judgment is more likely to be ratified by the states if it passes the Congress. Legislators, both federal and state, should welcome its approach toward changing the Constitution in a sensible manner.

Comments from the Capital

CONFLICTS OF OUR TIMES

by Vant Neff

Have you heard of the Dust Committee? No, it isn't a housewife's unhappy chore. It is far more distasteful. Prior to the United Mine Workers Union election, hand-picked coal miners were permitted to join the ranks of Dustmen. They were paid \$65 a day, instead of the \$22 they might ordinarily earn down in the coal mines. Comparatively speaking, "Dusting" is an easy life. The Dustmen's function is to sweep in votes for a particular candidate—by hook or by crook. Their persuasive tactics paid off for Tony Boyle, the current UMW president, but not for Joseph Yablonski, who was found murdered. It is reported that union funds were tapped for the Dustmen's exorbitantly high wages. This is money that was clipped from the coal miners' pay envelopes, supposedly to be put aside for pensions and projects that would benefit the miners.

No one can say which of the two candidates—Boyle or Yablonski—would have made a better union president. But I hardly think that money clipped from the miners should have been used to pay con men—excuse me, Dustmen—to intimidate or coerce workers into voting for a particular candidate.

Some miners who didn't yield to the Dustmen's pressure methods the first time around were then escorted on gratis "indoctrination vacations"—paid for by union funds, naturally—until they were further convinced. When that didn't work, a little money usually did. In brief—union funds were used to buy people.

This was given as testimony by the son of the slain Yablonski before the Senate Labor Subcommittee. In my opinion, it's time to sweep out the Dustmen and anyone else responsible for corruption, violence and tyranny in unions. The workers pay for, and surely deserve, better leadership than this!

Note to the leftist Prime Minister of Sweden: For all of your country's reputedly liberal policies, wasn't the manner in which the Black Ambassador from the United States to Sweden was treated rather a shameful contradiction in principle? How about all the American deserters your country is harboring? And what about Sweden's offer of \$40 million to aid the Vietcong? As any observer of the international scene is aware, arbitrary conduct isn't a new role for Sweden. During World War II, she practiced her "neutrality" by supplying the Nazis with oil, ball bearings and other necessary materials to use in their war effort

against us. As a very astute observer said, "People don't change!"

The Mystery of the Flameless Fireman: If he's no longer necessary on trains since the switch from coal fires to diesel engines, why is he still riding the rails? Just to pad the payroll in order to keep the labor union's kitty fat and well-fed by having two men pay dues instead of one?



Travel tip to long-haired males: If you value your locks, keep out of Morocco. The border police there shear visitors whose hair is shaggy, unkempt and ridiculously long. Borderline cases, take your chances!

The other side of the coin: The son of a reputed Mafia leader was caught conspiring to melt down silver coins by the FBI. In protest, hundreds of alleged Mafia "family" members and supporters have marched in front of the FBI building in New York City, night after night. (Are you as weary as I am of all these protests?) Revealing, isn't it, that people who would never admit their Mafia ties under questioning are quick to turn up to support a suspected fellow Mafioso!

Caught in its own web: The National Labor Relations Board has consistently ruled in favor of the unions and given short shrift to the company management, and even to the individual worker. But not when it runs into its own labor problems! Staff members of the NLRB Professional Association complained to the Civil Service Commission over what they termed "breach of contract" because the NLRB refused to bargain over temporary job changes, and flatly made them mandatory. The NLRB officials claimed that they didn't have time to talk. Yet these are the same officials who have impeded many company managements from making necessary rapid decisions, resulting in tremendous losses in both profits and good will. It doesn't make sense to me. But neither does the way our country's old-hat labor

laws are applied to today's modern working society. Question: If the NLRB's rules don't work even for them, isn't something drastically wrong with the rules, and the NLRB?

Some policemen are so proud of being called "Pigs" that they've been sporting badges labelling themselves just that. In their case, the name is qualified by the meaning, "Patriotism, Integrity, Guts!"

It is apparent that the incessant and excessive wage demands of labor are forcing our country to the brink of economic disaster. There is no reason why a worker who produces, let's say, two umbrellas should not be paid more than a man who produces only one. But the union that demands a three-umbrella-salary for a person who is only making one umbrella is actually imposing a higher price per umbrella on you and me. It's a vicious cycle that brings inflation raining down on us, along with a shower of endless price increases for all kinds of commodities and services. As David Rockefeller, Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Corporation, stated, unless industry and labor assume "a more responsible attitude", we may all end up with a lot less.

A teacher was arrested for selling drugs to a teen age student outside the school. In this case, isn't it the teacher who needs a good, stiff lesson in morals?

The U. S. Supreme Court delivered a staggering blow to the labor leaders and they're infuriated. According to a new ruling, when a union signs a no-strike agreement, it must stick to its guns. While it doesn't mean we'll never suffer another strike, it is, to me, an indication that our courts are taking a firm stand on an important issue. Now, isn't it time for our legislators to hop on the same bandwagon and seek the changes in labor law that our country needs?

The super-wisdom of some journalists, especially those at the New York Times, is truly awesome. Just let the Nixon administration take any action whatsoever, and this privileged group has an instant evaluation of the "right" meaning and importance. Mr. Agnew, please take note. Another point: they criticize everyone else roundly, but they made such a big settlement with their workers that they were forced to increase the price of the newspaper 50%. If that isn't inflationary, what is?

**Letter To
 The Editor**

Dear Editor:

Enclosed please find my remittance for the next year's subscription of The Yancey Record. I enjoy your paper very much especially during this year when my vacation was cancelled due to problems here in Ft. Lauderdale.

You might be pleased to note that my subscription, which I pass around to others in the Police Department, has caused one of our Secretaries to purchase land in the Pensacola area, and others to become interested.

I certainly wish I could be sitting on one of the benches in the Town Square right now -- just relaxing.

Sincerely,
 Charles E. White
 Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.

If you haven't spoken with your insurance agent lately,

you're not dealing with our agency

ROBERTS INSURANCE AGENCY
 Burnsville, N.C.